

REMARKS

Claims 15-19 and 26-32 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney, U.S. Patent 5,917,484 and Kusmierszyk, U.S. Patent 5,828,992. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 recites “means for displaying a first screen on the display unit, the first screen displaying a plurality of selectable language options for selecting a display language; and means for displaying a second screen with an option on the display unit, the option having a same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed, wherein the first screen is displayed when the option is designated on the second screen.”

The Examiner maintains that Mullaney teaches the claimed first display screen and the Kusmierszyk teaches the claimed second display screen, wherein the first screen is displayed when the option is designated on the second screen. The Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to modify Mullaney to include the function key option of Kusmierszyk because it would provide users easy access to language selection screen by using function keys on a keyboard.

As previously asserted, and as shown in Figs. 2A and 2B of Kusmierszyk, the appearance of the function key F3 changes depending on whether the screen language is Russian or English. For instance, in Fig. 2A, the display language is Russian but element 36 shows that the F3 key is labeled “English Text F3.” In Fig. 2B the display language is English and the F3 key includes the Russian equivalent plus “F3.” The Examiner maintains that the appearance of the F3 key remains the same but this is clearly contradicted by Figs. 2A and 2B. Kusmierszyk states that the display may comprise a touch panel in which the display language is selectively controlled by the operator through touch panel selections displayed on the screen (col. 2, lines 28-31). In this case, as seen in Figs. 2A and 2B, the graphic which the user presses to switch between display languages will *not* have the same appearance regardless of the display language.

In the alternative, if the F3 key on the keyboard is used, then Kusmierszyk would fail to be actually teaching that the option (F3 key) is on the display unit, but would be located on the

operator keyboard 22 (see col. 2, line 25). Although the keyboard F3 key would look the same no matter what language is displayed, this option is not displayed on the display unit. Thus, no matter which embodiment of Kusmierczyk the Examiner selects, the fact remains that Kusmierczyk does not teach or suggest “a second screen with an option on the display unit, the option having a same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed.”

In addition, Kusmierczyk teaches that selecting the F3 option toggles the display language between Russian and English. Selecting F3 does not result in displaying the first screen, where the first screen displays a plurality of selectable language options for selecting a display language. Kusmierczyk does display a different screen when F3 is pressed, but this screen is not a screen which displays selectable language options. Thus, the Examiner’s assertion “Kusmierczyk teaches means for displaying a second screen with an option on the display unit, the option having the same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed, *wherein the first screen is displayed when the option is designated on the second screen*” is incorrect (emphasis added). Kusmierczyk simply fails to teach or suggest that which the Examiner asserts.

Furthermore, the Examiner’s own stated motivation for combining the references points out the difference between the prior art and the claimed invention. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to modify Mullaney in view of Kusmierczyk to provide users easy access to language selection screen by using function keys on a keyboard. However, if the function key on the keyboard is used, the apparatus created by combining the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner would fail to teach or suggest “means for displaying a second screen with an option on the display unit” because a function key on a keyboard is not an option *on* the display unit.

Still further, even if Kusmierczyk taught that which the Examiner asserts, there would have been no motivation to modify Mullaney in light of the teachings of Kusmierczyk. Kusmierczyk merely teaches toggling between two different screens, and does not relate in any way to displaying a language selection screen. It is not enough to merely toggle between two screens in Mullaney because Mullaney is directed to configuring a system locale in a computer system and offers a choice between many different languages, not just two. Merely being able to toggle

between two languages, which is the only thing being taught by Kusmierczyk, is not enough and is certainly not desirable in light of the objectives of Mullaney.

In light of the foregoing, the features of claim 15 are not taught or suggested by the cited art, either alone or in combination. Furthermore, there would have been no motivation to combine the references even if Kusmierczyk taught that which the Examiner asserts.

Claims 26, 27 and 30 recite substantially the same feature discussed above in connection with claim 15, and thus are allowable for the same reasons.

The dependent claims are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 325772015100.

Dated: April 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
2000 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 778-1646